

## REMARKS

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by the newly cited Watanabe (US 6,539,240 B1). This is a final rejection that is respectfully disagreed with, and traversed below.

Watanabe describes a data communication system that has a receiver for receiving a first character that represents a communication target, an action storage for storing data that represent various actions of a second character representing a user, and a device to specifying an action of the second character by using an operation member. A transmitter reads the data of the second character corresponding to the specified action and transmits the data to the communication target. A synthesizer is provided for synthesizing the data received by the receiver and the data read from the action storage for displaying a synthesized image having the first and second characters. A character corresponding to a user can be displayed, and when an action of the character is specified, image data is transmitted that corresponds to the action.

In order to even further clarify the present invention, and to even further distinguish the claims from Watanabe, each of the independent claims has been amended in a somewhat similar manner to more particularly describe, in Claim 6, the already claimed "bookmark component", and in claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 to specifically recite the presence of the bookmark component. For example, claim 6 now recites that the bookmark component comprises:

"at least one Universal Resource Identifier (URI) corresponding to a resource that is reachable by a user of the multi-component logical entity through a data communications network".

Support can be found at least in paragraphs [0067] to [0070].

Claim 1 was clarified by amendment to recite in part that the entity further comprises:

"a bookmark component that comprises at least one address corresponding to a

resource that is reachable by a user of the entity through a data communications network", and

method claims 2, 4 and 5 were each similarly amended to state that the entity further comprises:

"a bookmark component that comprises at least one address corresponding to a resource, the method further comprising accessing the resource through a data communications network using the address".

Watanabe neither discloses or suggests similar subject matter.

When rejecting claim 6 the Examiner refers to Watanabe at col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 36; col. 8, lines 50-61; and col. 11, lines 15-43 for purportedly teaching the use of a "bookmark component". The portions of Watanabe have been carefully reviewed, and it is not seen where there is any similar subject matter that is described or suggested. If the Examiner believes otherwise, he is respectfully requested to specifically point out where Watanabe discloses the use of a bookmark component, or some equivalent functionality.

The foregoing amendment to claim 6 merely clarifies subject matter that was already present in the claims, and the amendment to claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 simply extends this subject matter to the other independent claims. The entry of the proposed claim amendment is thus earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully reminded that for a rejection to be made on the basis of anticipation, it is well recognized that "to constitute an anticipation, all material elements recited in a claim must be found in one unit of prior art", Ex Parte Gould, BPAI, 6 USPQ 2d, 1680, 1682 (1987), citing with approval In re Marshall, 578 F.2d 301, 304, 198 USPQ 344, 346 (CCPA 1978).

In the instant case, since at least the subject matter of the claimed "bookmark component" is not found in the Watanabe patent, this patent cannot be used to reject claim 6 under 35 USC 102(e) and, by extension, cannot be used to reject the other claims as now revised to incorporate a reference to the bookmark component.

S.N. 09/894,163  
Art Unit: 2686


Further, and by example only, the Examiner when rejecting claim 5 refers to Watanabe at col. 3, lines 18-45 and col. 12, lines 6-40 for purportedly teaching that an entity-enabled device includes an entity player for interpreting commands, and

"determining, by the entity player, whether the commands are compatible with the entity-enabled device; and interpreting, by the entity player, commands determined to be compatible with the entity-enabled device" (emphasis added).

The cited portions of Watanabe have been reviewed, and this claimed subject matter found in claim 5 is simply not found. If the Examiner believes otherwise he is respectfully requested to specifically point out where the claimed subject matter is purportedly found in Watanabe.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the merely clarifying amendment to claims 1-14, to reconsider and remove the final rejection of these claims, and to allow claims 1-14 as currently presented.

Respectfully submitted:

  
Harry F. Smith

11/12/2004  
Date

Reg. No.: 32,493

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: hsmith@hspatent.com

S.N. 09/894,163  
Art Unit: 2686



RECEIVED

NOV 16 2004

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

Technology Center 2600

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

11/12/04

Date

Clairine F. Mason

Name of Person Making Deposit